

opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to House Resolution 574, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of Lois G. Lerner to provide testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, SUCCESS AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4438, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 576 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 576

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from May 12, 2014, through May 16, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of

this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 8, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 4366) to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

SEC. 6. During consideration of the bill (H.R. 4438) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, pursuant to House Resolution 569, the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 569 is amended by striking "90 minutes" and inserting "one hour".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1345

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 576 provides for a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; and to that end, the House passed H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, last July.

Our efforts in reauthorization have centered on four principles: reducing the Federal footprint in education, empowering parents, supporting effective teachers, and restoring local control. H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, takes a small bipartisan step in the reauthorization process and ensures that local communities have the flexibility needed to meet the needs of their students.

While H.R. 5 is languishing in the Senate, the House remains committed to continuing its work and has broken out the charter school programs as an area of agreement between House Republicans and Democrats.

Despite good intentions, there is widespread agreement that the current

law is no longer effectively serving students. My hope is that, after the House passes H.R. 10 this week, our Senate colleagues will follow our lead and will provide the same opportunity to their Members to work together in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion and pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to visit a remarkable public school in Kernersville, North Carolina. In addition to preparing students academically for college, the North Carolina Leadership Academy, a charter school, is publicly committed to giving students “the opportunity to develop true leadership qualities and become creative thinkers and problem-solvers while retaining a sense of responsibility for their families, their community, and their country.”

It was a privilege to spend time with the remarkable students and faculty of this public charter school. I was truly impressed by their commitment to scholarship, by the leadership skills of the students and by the remarkable academic progress that was on display.

All NCLA students in grades 7–12 participate in Civil Air Patrol, a program established by Congress in 1946 that uses military-style uniforms, customs, courtesies, ceremonies, and drill in order to improve students’ leadership skills, fitness, and character.

This program is working. NCLA places a strong emphasis on family involvement, and the level of commitment demonstrated by parents, families, and the Piedmont community at large was impressive.

H.R. 10 will empower States and local communities to replicate the success of high-quality charter schools like NCLA and encourage choice, innovation, and excellence in education. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to have a clean rule around a bill that I had the opportunity to work on, along with the gentlelady from North Carolina and with our ranking member and chair, with regards to taking what we can agree on in education, which is reauthorizing the Federal Charter School Program.

We had similar language in both the Republican ESEA reauthorization, as well as in the Democratic substitute. Most Republicans voted for the version that they had, and almost every Democrat, except for two, voted for the Democratic version.

We were able to then work out the very small differences between the two pieces of language with regard to charter schools, present it before the entire House under a reasonable rule that allows for a broad variety of amendments—12 amendments—from both sides of the aisle, many of which improve the bill and some of which I op-

pose, but which are, by no means, fatal to the bill. The process fundamentally works.

Unfortunately, in this rule, we have now had to alter the way that we are dealing with another unrelated, unpaid-for effort, namely, a bill that could add \$155.5 billion to our deficit because of the extension of the R&D tax credit.

Essentially, under the initial effort, the Republicans failed to waive their statutory PAYGO rules. What that means is that they failed to say: we don’t have to pay for this bill. They failed to say: this bill will add to the deficit. In a few moments, my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, will explain what that means.

What the American people need to know is that this rule prevents Congress from doing fake math, and it essentially acknowledges that the Republican proposal to extend the R&D tax credit would be a deficit buster and increase our deficit by \$155.5 billion.

It takes away any pretension that somehow this bill would be paid for by some other mechanism; so while the amendments allowed in the content of the bill with regard to charter schools, which I will talk about in a moment, are largely noncontroversial and enjoy support from both sides of the aisle, the budgetary pretense that is removed from this bill, which reveals that the Republican proposal on the R&D tax credit increases our deficit by \$150 billion, is a controversial element that now occurs in this same rule.

I now want to talk about the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act. This important bipartisan bill improves and modernizes the Federal Charter Schools Program.

We essentially established a 2.0 version 14 years later, in having learned a lot about what works and doesn’t work in the field with regard to public charter schools. We promote equity in opportunity for our students across our country.

I am very pleased and honored that many of the important aspects of the bipartisan bill that I have had the honor to lead, the All-STAR Act, have been included in this underlying bill, as well as almost all of the priorities for the Democrats and Republicans.

When Congress first authorized the Charter Schools Program in 1994, charter schools were very early in their existence. They were an emerging effort to encourage innovation in our public schools.

Public charter schools with the ability to make site-based decisions—and that is essentially what charter schools are, they are public schools with site-based management—now serve more than 2 million students in 42 States and in the District of Columbia.

Sadly, there are over 600,000 students who remain on public charter school waiting lists, unable to attend the schools of their choice.

The promise of public charter schools is that they are free to be innovative

when it comes to instruction, scheduling, time-on-task, policies, mission, and hours. Because they have site-based management, rather than being run by a larger entity like a district or a State, they have the flexibility to do what it takes to meet the needs of parents in their communities.

Public charter schools don’t charge tuition, nor do they have any entrance requirements, nor are they allowed to discriminate against students on any basis. This bill goes a step further in ensuring transparency and accountability for charter schools to allay the concerns of some on my side of the aisle that they are not fully compliant with many of these areas.

The Charter Schools Program is a crucial lifeline for growing and replicating successful models. Charter school programs are critical to ensuring that every child in this country, regardless of ZIP code or economic background, has access to a free, quality education, which is more important than ever in order for one to succeed in the 21st century.

I am proud to say that H.R. 10, which will be considered under this rule, passed the Committee on Education and the Workforce with a very strong, bipartisan vote of 36-3. This is an example of a bill that has gotten better every step of the way.

A similar bill in the 112th Congress passed overwhelmingly with over 350 votes. Better language with regard to charter schools was included in both the Republican version of the ESEA reauthorization, as well as in the Democratic substitute.

Now, we have a stand-alone bill before us which takes the very best of both, the bill that was in the Republican version and in the Democratic version. It builds on it, and it creates a Federal charter school program that, truly, Democrats and Republicans can be proud of as a legacy for the next decade.

Having founded two innovative public charter schools before I was elected to Congress, I understand firsthand how the freedom to innovate and having the flexibility to pursue a unique mission can truly help serve all kids.

Without the Federal charter school program, many charter schools across our country wouldn’t even be able to get off the ground. We owe it to kids who are being underserved or who are unserved today to be able to upgrade this program and ensure it can meet the challenges of the 21st century.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take the opportunity to thank my colleague from Colorado for the work that he has done on charter schools, for understanding the very important nature of charter schools and for bringing his expertise to this issue.

I also want to thank him for acknowledging the bipartisan effort that has gone into bringing this legislation to the floor and for the very good way

that we have gone through regular order to bring this bill to the floor. I appreciate that little history that he has given us.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), my classmate and colleague.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support charter schools—I want to be clear about that—and I support this bill. However, I also believe that families should be able to choose schools within the public system that best meet their needs.

When it comes to students' education, we definitely know that one size does not fit all. The same is true for charter schools. Different systems work better for different communities.

We agree that it is wrong when the administration forces its vision for education reform on the States through grant programs, like Race to the Top, but that means it is equally wrong when Congress uses grant programs to do exactly the same thing.

This bill seeks to force States to remove existing caps on charter schools by giving priority to grant applications from States that do not have caps.

By doing this, Congress is punishing 20 States and Washington, D.C., whose charter laws have caps, including my home State of Washington.

There may be legitimate reasons these States have caps, but this bill doesn't recognize that. Charter schools for the sake of having charter schools definitely is not the answer. It won't help students.

That is why I am extremely disappointed that my bipartisan amendment was not made in order. It would have simply removed the provision that punishes certain State-designed charter systems, allowing States to compete equally for grants.

As the voice of the people, Congress should do better than the unelected bureaucrats down the street at the Education Department. Let's start saying "no" to top-down education reform and "yes" to states' rights.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1400

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I want to start by congratulating the bipartisan effort on the charter school bills. I thank Mr. POLIS for his leadership on that. And I wish that was all there was to say about this rule. Unfortunately, it is not.

You might think this rule was only about charter schools. The title is, Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act. But then if you turn a couple pages in, you will find in paragraph 13 a reference to H.R. 4438. That is not the charter school bill. That is what we call the research and development tax credit bill.

So why is it here in this rule on charter schools, and why does it reference part B of the rule in front of us now, which says that the budgetary effects of this act shall not be entered on either the PAYGO scorecard—and it goes on to say some other things?

Well, the PAYGO scorecard has nothing to do with charter schools. It does have something to do with the R&D tax credit. And I want to explain to people what has happened here because it is important that the public know.

Last night, we were scheduled to have the debate on a bill to extend the R&D tax credit law. We were all ready to go, and all of a sudden the debate stopped and the plug was pulled.

And so I have got to say something for a second about this research and tax development credit.

I think the idea of extending the R&D tax credit bill is broadly supported. That is not the issue on the tax credit bill. The issue is a permanent extension that is not paid for.

There are a number of other bills coming out of the Ways and Means Committee. When you add them all up, they add \$310 billion to our deficit. Unpaid for. Put it on our credit card.

It is kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it was only about 3 or 4 weeks ago that here on the floor of this House we had a debate on the Republican budget and they told us the number one priority was to reduce that deficit. Yet now we have a bunch of bills that say let's put it on the credit card.

And, Mr. Speaker, you know that at the end of the day, we all have to pay when we put it on our credit card.

We pointed out that if you don't pay for it by closing some other special interest tax breaks, like tax breaks for big oil companies, someone else is going to have to pay.

Now what we didn't realize is that the Republican plan as of last night was to pay for the R&D tax credit extension by cutting Medicare, Mr. Speaker. Because their failure to come up with offsets in the bill meant that current law would continue in effect.

In the past, we have turned off the trigger that says it is paid for by a sequester to a number of programs, the biggest being Medicare. But our Republican colleagues didn't turn it off.

So when they decided not to pay for the R&D tax credit in the bill and decided not to turn off the sequester, what they were aiming for was to have Medicare pay for that tax extender and to ask the people who depend on that program to foot the bill for the R&D tax credit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we blew the whistle on that issue last night. We saw our colleagues go scampering back to the Rules Committee to change it.

We will talk a little later today, but the bottom line is the same. When you put stuff on the credit card, someone pays the piper at the end of the day.

We have proposed paying for it, in part, by closing some of the wasteful special interest tax loopholes in the

Code. We think the R&D tax credit is a pro-growth policy, but subsidies to big oil companies; no.

And so, because our Republican colleagues don't want to pay for it in the bill, they are going to increase the deficit. In fact, the rule yesterday waived the rules of the House. Because the R&D tax credit bill was inconsistent with the Republicans' own budget.

The budget that was passed 3 or 4 weeks ago, it is inconsistent with it. Even under the Enron accounting in that budget, it throws it out of balance. Our Republican colleagues need to know that. You are putting it on the credit card. At the end of the day, that means if you are not going to ask Medicare to pay for it, which apparently had been the original plan, you are going to be cutting our kids' education, you are going to be cutting research at places like the National Institutes of Health that try to find cures and treatments for diseases. You are going to be letting the infrastructure of this country come to a halt. In fact, the budget calls for allowing the transportation trust fund to go insolvent.

That is what happens when you refuse to take fiscal responsibility and pay for things.

It was interesting to discover that the plan last night was to allow the Medicare cut to go into effect to pay for it. We are glad we are not doing that anymore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We are glad that after we called attention to that issue, our Republican colleagues realized that it was not a good idea to have an across-the-board cut in Medicare to pay for business tax incentives. We are glad they woke up to that fact.

But the underlying report here is going to remain the same. Putting \$310 billion on the credit card, someone has got to pay. We should take the responsibility in this House to figure out how we are going to do it.

We put forward proposals as to how to do it. Unfortunately, despite having passed a budget a couple of weeks ago, they are now waiving their rules on their own budget for these purposes.

I look forward to the conversation later today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Yesterday, our Democratic colleagues in the Rules Committee properly notice that had the R&D bill would have inadvertently triggered automatic cuts to other programs to offset the bill. We appreciate the spirit of comity that existed and that brought that to our attention.

H. Res. 576 ensures that the bill operates the way it was intended to operate. It was an inadvertent error. Excluding this bill from the PAYGO scorecard will ensure that other programs are not affected, which is consistent with the treatment of other tax bills.

I would like to point out to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the PAYGO amendment made by H. Res. 576 is substantially identical to section 401 of Senator WYDEN's extenders bill, S. 2260, the EXPIRE Act. However, they have failed to point that out.

Statutory PAYGO was created by the Democrats when they controlled Congress. Statutory PAYGO maintains a running tally of the cumulative deficit impact for bills signed into law. If the threshold is exceeded, a sequester is triggered to offset the excess.

When Republicans took control of the House, we adopted a new rule known as CUTGO, which requires that any new direct spending be offset by cuts to other direct spending programs.

We should reduce spending and reform our entitlement programs, Mr. Speaker. House Republicans have shown we are willing to do so, and we earnestly desire a partner in the Senate and the White House to do just that. But we should also grow our economy. This bill will help us do just that, and we hope we will find partners on the other side of the aisle.

Again, I want to say that the PAYGO amendment made by H. Res. 576 is substantially identical to section 401 of Senator WYDEN's extenders bill, S. 2260, the EXPIRE Act. My guess is my colleagues will be supporting that.

I now would like to turn our attention back to the subject at hand, charter schools, and I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from my home State for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in supporting this rule to bring H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act, to the floor.

Education is a key that can open the door to opportunity, which is important to families across America, and especially those in my district in North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, we know that a one-size-fits-all approach to education simply never works for students, as students vary greatly in how they learn. Because of this, I believe we should offer students and their parents every possible opportunity to select a school that best fits their individual needs, their goals, and their aspirations. And, Mr. Speaker, neither a student's ZIP Code nor circumstances should determine the educational opportunities available to them.

In my district, North Carolina's 13th District, we have six charter schools that are serving the local communities, in addition to our quality public schools in North Carolina. While developing and expanding the use of charter schools is certainly not the only answer to the education crisis facing our Nation, it is without a doubt a step in the right direction. The rule before us today to bring H.R. 10 up for debate

and a vote does just that by offering more choice to parents and students through the expanded use of charter schools.

The Success and Opportunity Through Charter Schools Act will facilitate the establishment of quality charter schools and support innovation and excellence in education. It also makes necessary improvements to charter school programs to encourage States, and those efforts already underway, to expand the use of charter schools.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE and the committee for their hard work, and I urge support for the rule and H.R. 10.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to come and join in an aspect of our bipartisan work that is working for children, and I thank the Education Committee and Mr. POLIS for their leadership in focusing on the idea that our children need the best education.

I also know the hearts of the Education Committee members and Mr. POLIS in recognizing that public schools are a valuable asset, having been educated throughout my primary and secondary education in public schools. We want to have the opportunity to match excellence with excellence and to ensure that the oversight allows for excellence.

So H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Act, brings all of this together: respecting teachers, holding children to a higher standard, and giving them the necessary tools.

I am glad that I had an amendment that will be in the manager's amendment that deals with requiring the Secretary to report issues regarding the age, race, and gender at charter schools, and also, the attrition and college acceptance. It has that same requirement for the teachers, as far as teacher attrition. That is important. That is already in the manager's amendment.

I also think more transparency and information to the parents on the Web sites concerning orientation materials, enrollment curriculum, student discipline, and behavior codes adds to this legislation. In that, we can ensure that there will be policies to prevent any bullying or even to have bullying intervention so that our children can have a better quality of life.

This is a holistic approach to educating our children. I believe the underlying bill speaks volumes that our children are our most precious resource. I hope that, as we continue, we will be able to work on other items, such as unemployment insurance and comprehensive immigration reform, because these are ways that we show America that we are working for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When we put forward legislation that focuses on the education of our children and the choices that our children can make, balanced alongside of ensuring the lifting of the boats of public education, we are in the right direction.

I am delighted to support this legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleague from North Carolina points out, support for school choice is growing. A 2013 public opinion survey found that 73 percent of Americans supported school choice, whereas 67 percent of Americans supported school choice in 2010.

Forty-two States and the District of Columbia have passed legislation to support the funding of public charter schools. They are becoming more popular. In the 2012–2013 academic year, more than 500 new charter schools opened across the country, which means there are now 6,200 charter schools in America and 2 million charter school students.

If recent growth continues, they will double in number by 2025 and will educate 4.6 million children. That amounts to 10 percent of all public school students.

□ 1415

Another sign of their popularity is that charter schools have over 1 million students on their wait lists.

H.R. 10 modernizes and streamlines the current Charter Schools Program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to ensure that States can support the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools.

These schools empower parents to play a more active role in their child's education, open doors for teachers to pioneer fresh teaching methods, encourage State and local innovation, and help students escape underperforming schools.

H.R. 10 is a commonsense approach to updating the Charter Schools Program by streamlining multiple charter school programs, improving quality, and promoting the growth of the charter school sector at the State level.

This bill benefits children, their parents, and—ultimately—our economy. By increasing the number of high-quality charter schools, more children will acquire the skills they need to succeed in a competitive global economy.

We owe it to our children to provide them with the best education possible, and that is what this bill was designed to do.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

How exciting that in a week here of partisan division with regard to Benghazi, with regard to Lois Lerner, with regard to a deficit-busting \$155 billion tax expenditure, how exciting that Democrats and Republicans can come together around something that is so important for the next generation of American children—that is, making sure that our limited investment in public charter schools has the maximum positive impact on student achievement across our country.

A 2013 study conducted by Stanford University's Center for Research on Educational Outcomes found that public charter schools often outperform their peers in traditional public schools, and many have demonstrated substantial progress in closing the achievement gap.

The study's findings were particularly impressive for low-income students. The study found that low-income students gained 14 additional days of learning in reading and 22 in math—compared to traditional school peers—and English language learners gained 36 days of learning in reading and in math.

What is clear, however, is just how public charter schools with site-based management have the ability to innovate and succeed. They also have the ability to fail and do poorly.

Not all charter schools are serving students well. Not all charter schools meet their goal of serving at-risk students. That is why this bill improves transparency and accountability for the public charter school sector as a whole, as well as for authorizers—that is, the entity, usually a school district, sometimes a State or special entity—that grants the charter, which is another word for contract, to the provider of educational services at the site-based level.

Mr. Speaker, all public schools, regardless of their governance structure, whether they are public magnet schools, whether they are neighborhood schools, whether they are public charter schools, whether they are schools of choice operated by a school district, every public school should live up to our promise of providing a quality education; and every child should have access to a quality education that allows them to succeed in the workforce, in college, and in life.

In this era of constrained public resources, we need to maximize the impact of every dollar spent by making sure that what we invest in works, and that is exactly what this bill does.

It allows for investment in proven models to expand and replicate success, to serve more kids, many of whom were already on waiting lists and forced to attend a school that is worse than the one that they seek to attend. This bill will help alleviate those waiting lists.

It is important to focus our resources and double down on public charter schools that get great results and en-

sure that we don't squander our limited resources on public charter schools that fail to meet the needs of their students.

We want to make sure that charter school operators with a strong evidence of student achievement and strong management capacity are able to replicate and expand. That is why, under this bill, we create incentives for schools to achieve and replicate excellence by awarding grants directly to some of the highest performing public charter schools in our country that are helping to allow more and more kids from at-risk backgrounds to achieve the American Dream.

This particular program, which was an important part of the bipartisan All-STAR Act, helps to seed the growth of high-performing public charter schools in States that might otherwise not meet the criteria.

The gentleman from Washington State mentioned that his State and some others have a cap. Well, very importantly, even where a district or State policy environment is not ideal and, therefore, they might not be a priority for receiving grants that they administer, nevertheless, charter schools serving kids in those areas can receive grants because of the networks of charter schools that are high performing in States that might not have policies that are as open to charters as they should be.

Mr. Speaker, what Democrats and Republicans coming together shows the country, shows the public charter school movement, shows the school districts, is that a multistakeholder approach can work for our country.

I want to thank the many individuals who provided input on this important bill, ranging from school districts to States to teachers' unions, to charter school board members, to families who are in charter schools, and families who languish on waiting lists, wanting their child to attend a better school.

The result of this multiyear process is a bill that reflects the very best policies to upgrade the existing charter school authorization program, improve transparency and accountability for public charter schools, ensure that our limited Federal resources are invested in schools that work and ensure that more kids, regardless of their geography and economic background, can attend a school that prepares them to succeed in life.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unfortunately, over the last 4 decades, the Federal Government's role in elementary and secondary education has increased dramatically. The Department of Education currently runs more than 80 K-12 education programs, many of which overlap.

As a school board member, I saw how the vast reporting requirements for these Federal programs tie the hands of State and local school leaders and

prevent them from making the best education available to their students.

Since 1965, Federal education funding has tripled, yet student achievement remains flat. More money is clearly not going to solve the challenges we face in education.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has refused to work with Congress to address these challenges and has, instead, taken unprecedented action to further expand its authority over America's schools.

Through the President's waiver scheme and pet programs such as Race to the Top, the Secretary of Education has granted himself complete discretion to use taxpayer dollars to coerce States into enacting the President's preferred education reforms.

Adding insult to injury, President Obama continues to push for more Federal education spending, requesting a staggering \$82.3 billion in mandatory and discretionary funds for the Department of Education in his fiscal year 2015 budget.

Our children deserve better, Mr. Speaker. It is past time to acknowledge more taxpayer dollars and more Federal intrusion cannot address the challenges facing schools.

H.R. 10 recognizes that local communities know their needs better than any bureaucrat in Washington and supports the sharing of best practices among charter schools and traditional public schools. Our students do better when educators work together to put in place the best strategies to help students learn.

Additionally, H.R. 10 specifically encourages charter schools to reach out to at-risk students in their communities, as well as those who have disabilities or are English learners.

Again, the local officials know best how to serve their communities, and the Federal Government should not tie their hands as they work to make the best decisions for their students.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentlelady has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. We do not have further speakers, Mr. Speaker, but I do intend to share some additional information on this bill and the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of my experiences in the charter school movement before joining this body. I had the opportunity to found a public charter school, New America School, now which has five campuses in Colorado and New Mexico. I also had the opportunity to cofound Academy of Urban Learning in Denver, Colorado.

New America School seeks to meet the needs of English language learning students who are a little bit older—15,

16, 18, 19—and far too often didn't have a place in the traditional public school system.

Many of these students work jobs—might work a day job, might work a night job. That means, if they work a day job, the only school that would be a viable option for them would be an evening school. That is why New America school has flexible scheduling, allowing students to attend day or night, depending on their real-world life circumstances.

In addition, many of the young women attending the school have young children of their own, and that is a real-life need that, absent some kind of daycare reimbursement or daycare, many of them would not be able to attend.

So New America School offered daycare reimbursement—in some cases, daycare—so that these young women could continue to attend school and get a high school diploma.

First and foremost, the focus of New America School is to ensure that students can learn to be fluent and literate in the English language, which is so important to be able to succeed in today's economy.

As a result of this innovative approach and the focus on meeting student needs, thousands of students have enrolled in the various campuses of the New America School. I was proud to not only found them, but to have served as superintendent for 2 years.

I can honestly say that, absent this Federal program, the title V grant, we would probably not have been able to get New America School off the ground. Like so many charter schools across the country, until the doors open—and in that first year or two, when you are just beginning to add students, it is absolutely critical to be able to have this investment to open the doors.

Over the medium and long term, the schools need to stand or fall on their own. They need to succeed on their own and meet a market niche. We need to make sure that they are sound from a budgetary perspective, and this bill includes language that ups the bar on authorizers to do just that.

This bill passed the Education and the Work Force Committee with a 36–3 vote. I honestly can't remember another bill that had such strong bipartisan support recently on that committee. It is similar to and actually represents an improvement from H.R. 2218, which passed last Congress, 365–54.

This bill will improve charter school access and services for students; ensures that our limited Federal investment supports the expansion and replication of the very best high-quality charter schools; requires more transparency and accountability for charter schools; gives charter schools additional tools to continue to serve at-risk kids pursuant to their mission, including free and reduced lunch; as well as ensuring that they have the tools they need to serve a pro rata number of special education kids.

Almost every Democrat and Republican in this entire body has already voted for this bill. A very similar, almost identical bill was in both the Republican ESEA reauthorization and the Democratic alternative.

This takes very few differences between those versions, irons them out, and has language that both Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER agree builds upon the consensus that was reached in each of those bills.

That is why I hope that this bill passes with strong bipartisan support. There is a reason that we need strong bipartisan support. Unlike far too many bills that we call single chamber bills that are considered in this body and languish in the Senate—I understand much of the frustration of the majority party—this bill, with a resounding bipartisan vote, can be sent to the Senate, where a very nearly identical bill has a growing number of bipartisan cosponsors with the message that this body overwhelmingly supports improving our public charter school program; and we encourage the Senate to take it up.

That is why every Member of this body's vote, Mr. Speaker, is so important on this bill. This bill will pass. This bill will have bipartisan support.

For any of my friends on the fence, this is our last great opportunity to leave a positive legacy of improving quality of and accountable for public charter schools.

□ 1430

AFT and NEA have acknowledged that the stronger accountability in this bill will improve the quality and accountability and transparency of charter schools, supported by charter school advocates as well as authorizers, like school districts.

The multistakeholder approach that Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member MILLER have presided over is a model of how this body can come together around legislation that improves our country. I hope that not only this bill is taken up by the Senate after a strong bipartisan vote in this body, but I hope it serves as a model not only for what we can do in education, but what we can do on a number of pressing issues that address this country, whether it is balancing our Federal budget, whether it is reauthorizing Federal transportation programs or establishing an infrastructure bank. There is, in fact, a bipartisan way forward. That is the opportunity that my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have before us now.

Public charter schools are making a difference for kids across our country every day. With a limited Federal role, we can ensure that they make an even bigger difference. The families that are languishing on waiting lists have the opportunity to send their kids to expansion of an existing successful charter school or the replication or a second campus of a charter school that we know works, that we know can trans-

form lives, that we know can help that young kid attend college, get a good job and, guess what, maybe even serve in this august body someday.

The most exciting thing about public education in this country is that there are examples of what works. You could take any at-risk demographic group, whether they are English language learners, whether they are low-income earners, whether they are in the most remote rural part of our country or in the poorest inner city area, and find an educational model that works. Some of them are run by school districts, as in neighborhood schools; some are run by school districts as schools of choice or magnet schools; and some are run as public charter schools under a contract in the school district or other authorizer.

What we need to do to help make sure that more kids have access to opportunity is expand and replicate what is already working in public education. That glimmer of hope, those shining islands of success and excellence with the passage of this bill, can serve more children in our country to ensure that more kids have access and more families have access to choose the public schools that work for them.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Chairman KLINE, and the majority and minority staff of the committee for working hard to craft a bipartisan bill without poison pills, without gotchas, without partisanship, that recognizes the vital role that strong, accountable, high-performing public charter schools can play in educational success. I was honored to work with them and with the staff on this legislation to improve, upgrade, and modernize this critical program.

I encourage my colleagues to understand that this vote matters. We want to ensure that this bill is not a single Chamber bill. We want to make sure that this bill does not languish in the Senate. And the best way to do that is to send a resounding vote, even stronger than the vote in the last Congress, that in these times of partisan discord, Democrats and Republicans can come together around commonsense legislation that helps kids succeed and helps America's neediest families send their kids to a quality public school. This bill will help maximize the impact of every dollar invested by focusing on the highest quality educational providers.

I strongly urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 10 and ensure that our limited Federal dollars go only to quality programs.

As we mentioned earlier, unfortunately, I cannot support this rule. The rule contains a budgetary fix on an unrelated item. I am confident this rule will pass and allow for consideration of the charter school bill and a reasonable set of amendments, and I wish that I could support a rule that did just that. But this bill does include \$150 billion in deficit spending which Democrats have not agreed to.



Public school choice is effective and empowering. Families know what is right for their children better than politicians do and better than school district officials do; therefore, parents should have the opportunity to choose the public school of their choice that meets the parents' and the family's need.

H.R. 10 represents the very best promise of bipartisanship in education. For those that embrace school choice, H.R. 10 rewards State policies that contribute to public charter school success. For those who are skeptical of public charter schools, H.R. 10 builds in stronger protections for charter school oversight, transparency, and accountability. There is something for everybody in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule but "yes," "yes," "yes" on the underlying bill. And I look forward to continuing this tradition of bipartisanship, hopefully extending beyond education to the other pressing national challenges we face. Through this bill, we can improve access to great schools for our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to truly thank my colleague from Colorado for his eloquent words of support for charter schools and for his past efforts in this area. I particularly want to thank him for urging the Senate to take up this legislation. As he well knows, we have a lot of good legislation over in the Senate that has not been acted upon, and I hope this bill will have a better fate in the Senate than other bills have had.

Mr. Speaker, it would be imprudent to have a conversation about education and the use of taxpayer money without discussing the need for accountability. Hardworking taxpayers want to see their tax dollars being used in the best way possible and expect the Federal Government to be a wise steward of their dollars.

H.R. 10 builds on the principle of local accountability by modernizing the Charter Schools Program to authorize States to use the funding to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools. The schools with proven student success will have the opportunity to offer those advantages to more students.

States and local educators know their students best, and I urge my colleagues to modernize Federal school programs and respond to these needs by supporting both this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, many of my Republican colleagues and I would prefer we abide by the Constitution and take the Federal Government out of education altogether, but that is not what we are recommending here today because we know we can't achieve that goal. My assumption, though, is that all Members of Congress—all Members of Congress—agree that as long as taxpayer money is being used by the Federal

Government to fund education, that Congress has a responsibility to make a strong effort to ensure that those who receive hardworking taxpayer money are being held accountable for how they use it. Washington should live within its means, just as families all across this country do, and limited resources require wise stewardship.

This bill consolidates multiple funding streams and grant programs that support charter schools into the existing State grant program, eliminating a separate authorization for charter school facilities funding. It reduces the overall authorization for charter school programs from \$450 million to \$300 million. By consolidating the funding streams into the existing State charter school program, the bill removes authority from the Secretary of Education to pick winners and losers and control the growth of the charter school sector. This authority is placed largely in the hands of States, where it belongs.

H.R. 10 promotes high-quality charter schools by updating the Charter Schools Program to reflect the success and growth of the charter school movement. States are authorized to use funds under the program to support the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools in addition to supporting new innovative charter school models.

Mr. Speaker, my background as an educator, school board member, mother, and grandmother reinforces my belief that students are best served when people at the local level are in control of education decisions. I also believe that education is the most important tool that Americans at any age can have.

I was the first person in my family to graduate from high school and went to college, where I worked full-time and attended school part-time. It took me 7 years to earn my bachelor's degree, and I continued to work my way through my master's and doctoral degrees. From my own experience, I am convinced this is the greatest country in the world for many reasons, not the least of which is that a person like me, who grew up extremely poor in a house with no electricity and no running water, with parents with very little formal education and no prestige at all, could work hard and be elected to the United States House of Representatives.

No legislation is perfect, and that is why I look forward to working with my colleagues to address their concerns and improve this legislation through the amendment process. However, I have never been one to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. And while H.R. 10 isn't perfect, it is a step in the right direction of empowering parents, teachers, and local school districts, and increasing school choice and giving other young people the same opportunities that I and others have had to improve our lot in life. That is why I am a supporter of this legislation, and I

urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak during the House's consideration of the Rule for H.R. 10, the "Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act."

The Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act would revise the Charter School Program and the Public Charter Schools of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The rule before the House will pave the way for the consideration of a legislative proposal that consolidates two existing federal charter school programs into one:

The Charter School Program, which supports grants for charter school developers to open new charter schools. The program also provides funds to disseminate best practices and provide state facilities aid to charter schools.

The Charter School Credit Enhancement Program assists charter schools in accessing better credit terms to acquire and renovate facilities to operate a charter school.

The rule will allow the consideration of the bill that will create a new federal charter schools program to promote high-quality charter schools at the state and local level; and allows states to use federal funds to start new charter schools as well as expand and replicate existing high-quality charter schools.

The bill adds a new component—a Charter Management Organization grant program to support the opening of additional charter schools nationwide.

H.R. 10 establishes a new Charter School Program that would consist of three parts:

Grants to support high-quality charter schools will be awarded to a State Educational Agency, the State Charter School Board, the Governor, or a Charter School Support Organization.

Facilities Aid will be awarded to continue credit enhancement activities and support state facilities aid for charter schools.

National Activities will allow the secretary of education to operate a grant competition for charter schools in states that did not win or compete for a state grant and a competition for high quality CMOs.

The legislation adds five new definitions: a "charter management organization, a charter support organization", a "high-quality charter school"; the "expansion of a high-quality charter school"; and a "replicable, high-quality charter school model."

H.R. 10 authorizes \$300,000,000 for fiscal years 2015 through 2020. The bill permits state-determined weighted lotteries and allows students to continue in the school program of their choice by clarifying students in affiliated charter schools can attend the next immediate grade in that network's school.

JACKSON LEE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10

I have long supported the need for better data on the experiences of children that Congress could use when deliberating on legislative measures intended to benefit our young citizens.

The Education and Workforce Committee included language in the amendment in the form of a substitute for the bill that reflected an amendment I had intended to offer as a separate amendment. The language reflects the intent of my amendment by adding rates of student attrition as a measure to be considered by charter school authorizers in monitoring the successes of schools.

Attrition data would help us better understand the impact of charter schools on student retention. It would also bring additional transparency regarding the drivers of attrition issues such as discipline, counseling, drop-outs, bullying, as well as the impact of learning disabilities like dyslexia on student retention.

Although the data reporting is not mandatory, it is my hope that charter school districts and charter schools will take up the challenge of providing hard data to make the case for their approaches to education.

I offered two amendments for consideration by the House Rules Committee that would strengthen the legislative goals of H.R. 10.

The amendments were simple and were an important addition to this strong bipartisan effort from the Education and Workforce Committee to bring clarity and improve transparency of charter schools in communities around the Nation.

#### JACKSON LEE AMENDMENT NO. 1

The Jackson Lee amendment made in order by the Rules Committee for debate of this bill directs State Education Agencies that award Federally funded grants to charter schools to work with those schools so that they provide information on their websites regarding student recruitment, orientation materials, enrollment criteria, student discipline policies, behavior codes, and parent contract requirements, which should include any financial obligations such as fees for tutoring, and extra-curricular activities.

This Amendment will make it possible for parents to learn more about how schools deal with important education issues such as academic performance, enrichment programs, and quality of education life issues like reasonable accommodations for students with learning disabilities like dyslexia or physical disabilities.

Many charter schools already provide this information, and the amendment would support this good transparency practice. This Jackson Lee amendment is good for parents and for charter schools because parents would have access to information that helps them make education decisions for their children; and charter schools would speak to a larger audience regarding their education programs.

#### JACKSON LEE AMENDMENT NO. 2

The second Jackson Lee amendment was a "Sense of the Congress" on the promotion of, and support for anti-bullying programs in charter schools, including those serving rural communities.

I regret that this amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee because the prevention of bullying is one of the most challenging problems focusing school officials.

I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make this amendment in order for consideration under this bill.

I introduced H.R. 2585, the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013 because of the unresolved national epidemic of school bullying. This anti-bullying bill amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by expanding the juvenile accountability block grant program with respect to programs for the prevention of bullying to include intervention programs. The

bill's objective is to reduce and prevent bullying and establish best practices for all activities that are likely to help reduce bullying among young people.

This year a million children will be teased, taunted, and physically assaulted by their peers. Bullying is the most common form of violence faced by our Nation's youth.

The frequency and intensity of bullying that young people face are astounding: 1 in 7 students in grades K–12 is either a bully or a victim of bullying; 90% of 4th to 8th grade students report being victims of bullying of some type, 56% of students have personally witnessed some type of bullying at school; 71% of students report incidents of bullying as a problem at their school; 15% of all students who don't show up for school report it to being out of fear of being bullied while at school; 1 out of 20 students has seen a student with a gun at school; 282,000 students are physically attacked in secondary schools each month.

Consequences of bullying: 15% of all school absenteeism is directly related to fears of being bullied at school; According to bullying statistics, 1 out of every 10 students who drops out of school does so because of repeated bullying; Suicides linked to bullying are the saddest statistic.

Statistics on Gun Violence: Homicide is the 2nd leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 years old; Homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between ages 10 and 24; Thirteen young people from ages 10–24 become victims of homicide every day; 82.8% of those youths were killed with a firearm; Every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun; Every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or teenager loses their life to a firearm; In 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns; One of four high school males reportedly carry a weapon to school, with 8.6% of reportedly carry a gun; 87% of youth said shootings are motivated by a desire to "get back at those who have hurt them," and 86% said, "other kids picking on them, making fun of them or bullying them" causes teenagers to turn to lethal violence in the schools; In 2011, over 707,000 young people, aged 10 to 24 years, had to be rushed to the emergency room as a result of physical assault injuries.

I strongly believe that where our children are concerned, Congress is in a unique position to advocate on their behalf in an effective and forceful way. Letting children know by our actions that members of Congress consider the lives of children and their experience to be of the utmost importance would help them in countless ways.

We cannot gamble with our children's future, and ultimately the future of our nation. I am committed to finding ways to make sure that education is as valued as national defense—because education is crucial to our nation's global success in all areas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, with that, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

I. section 6, add "at the end of the bill" before the period.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1520

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 576, as amended;

The previous question on House Resolution 575;

Adoption of House Resolution 575, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2548.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.